arXiv:1610.02532v1 [math.PR] 8 Oct 2016

On uniform closeness of local times of Markov chains and i.i.d. sequences

Diego F. de Bernardini Christophe Gallesco
Serguei Popov *

October 11, 2016

Abstract

In this paper we use the soft local time technique to obtain a coupling between the field of local times at time n of a Markov chain, and the one of a sequence of n i.i.d. random variables with law given by the invariant measure of that Markov chain. As a result, we obtain upper bounds on the total variation distance between the two fields, which are uniform in n.

Keywords: occupation times, soft local times, decoupling, empirical processes.
Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 60J05; Secondary 60G09, 60J55.

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to compare the field of local times of a discrete-time Markov process with the corresponding field of i.i.d. random variables distributed according to the stationary measure of this process, in total variation distance. We mention that local times (also called occupation times) of Markov processes is a very well studied subject. It is frequently possible to obtain a complete characterization of the law of this field in terms of some Gaussian random field or process, especially in continuous time (and space) setup. The reader is probably familiar with Ray-Knight theorems as well as Dynkin's and Eisenbaum's isomorphism theorems; cf. e.g. [12, 14]. One should observe, however, that these theorems usually work in the case

*Department of Statistics, Institute of Mathematics, Statistics and Scientific Computation, University of Campinas – UNICAMP, rua Sérgio Buarque de Holanda 651, 13083–859, Campinas SP, Brazil; e-mails: {bernardini, gallesco, popov}@ime.unicamp.br

when the underlying Markov process is reversible and/or symmetric in some sense.

To explain what we are doing in this paper, let us start by considering the following example: let $(X_j)_{j\geq 1}$ be a Markov chain on the state space $\Sigma = \{0,1\}$, with the following transition probabilities: $\mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} = k \mid X_n = k] = 1 - \mathbb{P}[X_{n+1} = 1-k \mid X_n = k] = \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon$ for $k = 0, 1$, where $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ is small. Clearly, by symmetry, $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ is the stationary distribution of this Markov chain. Next, let $(Y_j)_{j\geq 1}$ be a sequence of i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with success probability $\frac{1}{2}$. What can we say about the distance in total variation between the laws of $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ and $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$? Note that the "naïve" way of trying to force the trajectories to be equal (given $X_1 = Y_1$, use the maximal coupling of X_2 and Y_2; if it happened that $X_2 = Y_2$, then try to couple X_3 and Y_3, and so on) works only up to $n = O(\varepsilon^{-1})$. Even though this method is probably not optimal, in this case it is easy to obtain that the total variation distance converges to 1 as $n \to \infty$. This is because of the following: consider the event

$$\Xi^Z = \Big\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j = Z_{j+1}\}} > \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \Big\},$$

where Z is X or Y. Clearly, the random variables $\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j = Z_{j+1}\}}$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ are i.i.d. Bernoulli, with success probabilities $\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ for $Z = X$ and $Z = Y$ correspondingly. Therefore, if $n \gg \varepsilon^{-2}$, it is elementary to obtain that that $\mathbb{P}[\Xi^X] \approx 1$ and $\mathbb{P}[\Xi^Y] \approx 0$, and so the total variation distance between the *trajectories* of X and Y is almost 1 in this case.

So, even in the case when the Markov chain gets quite close to the stationary distribution just in one step, usually it is not possible to couple its trajectory with an i.i.d. sequence, unless the length of the trajectory is relatively short. Assume, however, that we are not interested in the exact trajectory of X or Y, but rather, say, in the number of visits to 0 up to time n. That is, denote

$$L_n^Z(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j = 0\}}$$

for $Z = X$ or Y. Are $L_n^X(0)$ and $L_n^Y(0)$ close in total variation distance for *all* n?

Well, the random variable $L_n^Y(0)$ has the binomial distribution with parameters n and $\frac{1}{2}$, so it is approximately Normal with mean $\frac{n}{2}$ and standard deviation $\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2}$. As for $L_n^X(0)$, it is elementary to obtain that it is approximately Normal with mean $\frac{n}{2}$ and standard deviation $\sqrt{n}\big(\frac{1}{2} + O(\varepsilon)\big)$. Then, it is also elementary to obtain that the total variation distance between these

two Normals is $O(\varepsilon)$, *uniformly* in n (indeed, that total variation distance equals the total variation distance between the Standard Normal and the centered Normal with variance $(1+O(\varepsilon))^2$; that distance is easily verified to be of order ε). This *suggests* that the total variation distance between $L_n^X(0)$ and $L_n^Y(0)$ should be also of order ε uniformly in n. Observe, by the way, that the distribution of the local times of a two-state Markov chain can be explicitly written (cf. [3]), so one can obtain a rigorous proof of the last statement in a direct way, after some work.

Let us define the *local time* of a stochastic process Z at site x at time n as the number of visits to x up to time n:

$$L_n^Z(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j = x\}}$$

(sometimes we omit the upper index when it is clear which process we are considering). The above example shows that, if one is only interested in the local times of the Markov chain (and not the complete trajectory), then there is hope to obtain a coupling with the local times of an i.i.d. random sequence (which is much easier to handle). Observe that there are many quantities of interest that can be expressed in terms of local times only (and do not depend on the order), such as, for instance,

- hitting time of a site x: $\tau(x) = \min\{n : L_n(x) > 0\}$;
- cover time: $\min\{n : L_n(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma\}$, where Σ is the space where the process lives;
- blanket time [7]: $\min\{n \geq 1 : L_n(x) \geq \delta n \pi(x)\}$, where π is the stationary measure of the process and $\delta \in (0,1)$ is a parameter;
- disconnection time [6, 13]: loosely speaking, it is the time n when the set $\{x : L_n(x) > 0\}$ becomes "big enough" to "disconnect" the space Σ in some precise sense;
- the set of favorite (most visited) sites (e.g. [9, 15]): $\{x : L_n(x) \geq L_n(y) \text{ for all } y \in \Sigma\}$;
- and so on.

Therefore, if it is possible to obtain a coupling as above that works with high probability, then that coupling may be useful. Note also that, although not every Markov chain comes close to the stationary distribution in just one step, that can be sometimes circumvented by considering the process at times $k, 2k, 3k, \ldots$ with a large k.

In particular, we expect that our results may be useful when dealing with *excursion processes* (i.e., when Σ is a set of excursions of a random walk). One may e.g. refer to [10], cf. Lemma 2.2 there (note that the order of excursions does not matter, so one would be able to get rid of the factor m in the right-hand side); also, we are working now on applications of our results to the decoupling for random interlacements [2].

2 Notations and results

We start describing the assumptions under which we will prove our main result.

Let (Σ, d) be a compact metric space, with $\mathcal{B}(\Sigma)$ representing its Borel σ-algebra.

Assumption 2.1. *Assume that* (Σ, d) *is of* polynomial class*: there exist some* $\beta \geq 0$ *and* $\varphi \geq 1$ *such that for all* $r \in (0, 1]$*, the number of open balls of radius at most* r *needed to cover* Σ *is smaller than or equal to* $\varphi r^{-\beta}$*.*

As an example of metric space of polynomial class, consider first a finite space Σ, endowed with the discrete metric

$$d(x, y) = \mathbb{1}_{\{x \neq y\}}, \text{ for } x, y \in \Sigma.$$

In this case, we can choose $\beta = 0$ and $\varphi = |\Sigma|$ (where $|\Sigma|$ represents the cardinality of Σ). As a second example, let us consider Σ to be a compact k-dimensional Lipschitz submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^m$ with metric induced by the Euclidean norm of $\mathbb{R}^m$. In this case we can take $\beta = k$, but φ will in general depend on the precise structure of Σ. It is important to observe that, for a finite Σ, it may not be the best idea to use the above discrete metric; one may be better off with another one, e.g., the metric inherited from the Euclidean space where Σ is immersed (see e.g. the proof of Lemma 2.9 of [5]).

We consider a Markov chain $X = (X_i)_{i \geq 1}$ with transition kernel $\mathfrak{P}(x, dy)$ on $(\Sigma, \mathcal{B}(\Sigma))$, and we suppose that the chain has a unique invariant probability measure π. Moreover, we assume the transition kernel to be absolutely continuous with respect to π, $\mathfrak{P}(x, \cdot) \ll \pi(\cdot)$ for all $x \in \Sigma$. Let us denote by $p(x, \cdot)$ the Radon-Nikodym derivative (i.e., *density*) of $\mathfrak{P}(x, \cdot)$ with respect to π: for $x \in \Sigma$,

$$\mathfrak{P}(x, A) = \int_A p(x, y)\pi(dy), \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{B}(\Sigma).$$

We also consider

Assumption 2.2. *Assume that the density $p(x,\cdot)$ is* uniformly Hölder continuous*, that is, there exist constants $\kappa > 0$ and $\gamma \in (0,1]$ such that for all $x, z, z' \in \Sigma$,*

$$|p(x,z) - p(x,z')| \leq \kappa d^{\gamma}(z,z').$$

In the rest of this paper, we assume that the chain X starts with some probability law absolutely continuous with respect to π and we denote by ν its density. We also work under

Assumption 2.3. *Let $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$. Suppose that there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ such that*

$$\sup_{x,y\in\Sigma} |p(x,y) - 1| \leq \varepsilon, \tag{1}$$

and

$$\sup_{x\in\Sigma} |\nu(x) - 1| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{2}$$

Observe that (2) is not very restrictive because, due to (1), the chain will anyway come quite close to stationarity already on step 2.

Additionally, let us denote by $Y = (Y_i)_{i\geq 1}$ a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with law π.

Before stating our main result, we recall the definition of the total variation distance between two probability measures $\bar{\mu}$ and $\hat{\mu}$ on some measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{T})$,

$$\|\bar{\mu} - \hat{\mu}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \sup_{A\in\mathcal{T}} |\bar{\mu}(A) - \hat{\mu}(A)|.$$

When dealing with random elements U and V, we will write (with a slight abuse of notation) $\|U - V\|_{\mathrm{TV}}$ to denote the total variation distance between the laws of U and V. Denoting by $L_n^Z := (L_n^Z(x))_{x\in\Sigma}$ the local time field of the process $Z = X$ or Y at time n, we are now ready to state

Theorem 2.4. *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, there exists a positive constant $K = K(\varepsilon_0)$ such that, for all $n \geq 1$, it holds that*

$$\|L_n^X - L_n^Y\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq K\varepsilon\sqrt{1 + \ln(\varphi 2^{\beta}) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\Big(\frac{\kappa \vee (2\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\Big)}.$$

As an application of our main theorem, consider a finite state space Σ, endowed with the discrete metric. As we have already mentioned, in this case we can choose $\beta = 0$ and $\varphi = |\Sigma|$. Additionally, observe that, for any Markov chain X on Σ, under Assumption 2.3, we can always take $\kappa = 2$ and $\gamma = 1$, so the Hölder continuity of p is automatically verified here. Thus, Theorem 2.4 leads to

$$\|L_n^X - L_n^Y\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq K\varepsilon\sqrt{1 + \ln|\Sigma|},$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Observe that, since K is unknown, Theorem 2.4 becomes interesting only when ε is small enough. Therefore, it is also relevant to check if we can obtain a uniform control (in n) of $\|L_n^X - L_n^Y\|_{\mathrm{TV}}$ away from 1, for all $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. In this direction, we obtain the following

Theorem 2.5. *Under Assumptions 2.1–2.3, there exists a positive constant $K' = K'(\beta, \varphi, \kappa, \gamma, \varepsilon_0)$ such that, for all $n \geq 1$, it holds that*

$$\|L_n^X - L_n^Y\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - K'.$$

Such a result may be useful e.g. in the following context: if we are able to prove that, for the i.i.d. sequence, something happens with probability close to 1, then the same happens for the field of local time of the Markov chain with at least uniformly positive probability. Observe that it is not unusual that the fact that the probability of something is uniformly positive implies that it should be close to 1 then.

The rest of the paper is organized in the following way. In Section 3, among other things, we show how the soft local time method can be applied to the Markov chain X for constructing its local time field. In Section 4 we present the construction of a coupling between the local time fields of the two processes X and Y at time n. In Section 5 we estimate the total variation distance between two binomial point processes. This auxiliary result will be useful to bound from above the probability of the complement of the coupling event introduced in Section 4. In Section 6 we use a concentration inequality due to [1] together with the machinery of empirical processes to obtain some intermediate results. In Section 7 we give the proof of Theorem 2.4. Finally, in Section 8, we give the proof of Theorem 2.5.

We end this section with considerations on the notation for constants used in this paper. Throughout the text, in general, we use capital $C_1, C_2, \ldots$ to denote global constants that appear in the results. When these constants depend on some parameter(s), we will explicitly put (or mention) the dependence, otherwise the constants are considered universal. Moreover, we will use small $c_1, c_2, \ldots$ to denote local constants that appear locally in the proofs, restarting the enumeration at the beginning of each proof.

3 Constructions using soft local times

We assume that the reader is familiar with the general idea of using Poisson point processes for constructing general adapted stochastic processes, also known as the *soft local time* method. We refer to Section 4 of [11] for the general theory, and also to Section 2 of [4] for a simplified introduction.

In this paper we use a modified version of this technique to couple the local time fields of both processes, and we do this precisely in Section 4. In this section we first present two different constructions of the Markov chain X, and then we present a construction of the local time field of X only. Then, in Section 3.2, we present a construction of the i.i.d. sequence Y. All these constructions consist of applying the method of soft local times in a (relatively) straightforward way.

Let α be the *regeneration coefficient* of the chain X with respect to π (see Definition 4.28 of [8]) defined by

$$\alpha := \inf_{x,y\in\Sigma} p(x,y).$$

Note that $\alpha \leq 1$ since $p(x,\cdot)$ is a probability density for all $x \in \Sigma$. Moreover, (1) implies that $\alpha \geq 1-\varepsilon =: q$. Hence, we consider the following decomposition

$$p(x,\cdot) = q + (1-q)\mu(x,\cdot), \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma,$$

where $\mu(x,\cdot) = 1 + \frac{p(x,\cdot)-1}{1-q} \geq 0$ is a probability density with respect to π.

On some probability space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \mathbb{P})$, suppose that we are given the following independent random elements:

- A sequence $(I_j)_{j\geq 1}$ with $I_1 = 1$ and $(I_j)_{j\geq 2}$ i.i.d. Bernoulli(q) random variables;
- A Poisson point process η on $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_+$ with intensity measure $\pi \otimes \lambda_+$, where λ_+ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and π is the invariant probability measure of X (cf. Section 2).

Then, we define the sequence $(\rho_j)_{j\geq 0}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_0 &= 1, \\ \rho_{k+1} &= \inf\{j > \rho_k : I_j = 1\} \text{ for } k \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

We interpret the elements of the sequence $(\rho_j)_{j\geq 1}$ as being the random regeneration times of the Markov chain X: at each random time ρ_j, the chain X starts afresh with law π. In this way, the chain will be viewed as a sequence of (independent) blocks (called *regeneration blocks*) with starting law π and transitions according to $\mu(\cdot,\cdot)$. Such blocks thus have lengths given by the differences of the subsequent elements of $(\rho_j)_{j\geq 1}$.

3.1 Construction of the local time field of the Markov chain X

We first give two ways to construct the Markov chain X up to time n using soft local times. For that, we consider the Poisson point process described above,

$$\eta = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{(z_\lambda, t_\lambda)},$$

(where Λ is a countable index set), and we proceed with the soft local time scheme in the classical way first. Denote by $(x_i)_{i \geq 1}$ the elements of Σ which we will consecutively construct.

We begin with the construction of x_1 by defining

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1 &= \inf \Big\{ \ell \geq 0 : \exists (z_\lambda, t_\lambda) \text{ such that } \ell \nu(z_\lambda) \geq t_\lambda \Big\}, \\ G_1^X(x) &= \xi_1 \nu(x), \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

and (x_1, t_1) to be the unique pair (z_λ, t_λ) satisfying $G_1^X(z_\lambda) = t_\lambda$.

Then, once we have obtained the first state x_1 visited by the chain X, we proceed to the construction of the other ones. For $i = 2, 3, \ldots$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i = \inf \Big\{ \ell \geq 0 : \exists (z_\lambda, t_\lambda) \notin \{(x_k, t_k)\}_{k=1}^{i-1} \text{ such that} \\ G_{i-1}^X(z_\lambda) + \ell p(x_{i-1}, z_\lambda) \geq t_\lambda \Big\}, \\ G_i^X(x) = G_{i-1}^X(x) + \xi_i p(x_{i-1}, x), \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

and (x_i, t_i) to be the unique pair (z_λ, t_λ) out of the set $\{(x_k, t_k)\}_{k=1}^{i-1}$ satisfying $G_i^X(z_\lambda) = t_\lambda$.

Thus, after performing this iterative scheme for n iterations, we obtain the accumulated soft local time of the Markov chain X at time n, which is given by

$$G_n^X(x) = \xi_1 \nu(x) + \sum_{k=2}^{n} \xi_k p(x_{k-1}, x),$$

for $x \in \Sigma$.

Next, we present an alternative construction of the same Markov chain, taking into account the regeneration times of X, using the Poisson point process η and the sequence $(I_j)_{j \geq 1}$ of Bernoulli random variables introduced at the beginning of this section. Denote now by $(\hat{x}_i)_{i \geq 1}$ the elements of Σ which we will consecutively construct in this alternative way. By construction, the sequence $(\hat{x}_i)_{i \geq 1}$ will also have the law of the Markov chain X.

We begin with the construction of $\hat{x}_1$ by defining

$$\hat{\xi}_1 = \inf\Big\{\ell \geq 0 : \exists (z_\lambda, t_\lambda) \text{ such that } \ell\nu(z_\lambda) \geq t_\lambda\Big\},$$
$$\hat{G}_1^X(x) = \hat{\xi}_1\nu(x), \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma,$$

and $(\hat{x}_1, \hat{t}_1)$ to be the unique pair (z_λ, t_λ) satisfying $\hat{G}_1^X(z_\lambda) = t_\lambda$.

Then, once we have obtained the first state $\hat{x}_1$ visited by the chain X, we proceed to the construction of the other ones. For $i = 2, 3, \ldots$, define

$$g_i(\hat{x}_{i-1}, \cdot) = \begin{cases} \mu(\hat{x}_{i-1}, \cdot), & \text{if } I_i = 0, \\ 1, & \text{if } I_i = 1, \end{cases}$$

and then

$$\hat{\xi}_i = \inf\Big\{\ell \geq 0 : \exists (z_\lambda, t_\lambda) \notin \{(\hat{x}_k, \hat{t}_k)\}_{k=1}^{i-1} \text{ such that } \hat{G}_{i-1}^X(z_\lambda) + \ell g_i(\hat{x}_{i-1}, z_\lambda) \geq t_\lambda\Big\},$$
$$\hat{G}_i^X(x) = \hat{G}_{i-1}^X(x) + \hat{\xi}_i g_i(\hat{x}_{i-1}, x), \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma,$$

and $(\hat{x}_i, \hat{t}_i)$ to be the unique pair (z_λ, t_λ) out of the set $\{(\hat{x}_k, \hat{t}_k)\}_{k=1}^{i-1}$ satisfying $\hat{G}_i^X(z_\lambda) = t_\lambda$.

Thus, after performing this iterative scheme for n iterations, we obtain the accumulated soft local time at time n

$$\hat{G}_n^X(x) = \hat{\xi}_1\nu(x) + \sum_{k=2}^{n} \hat{\xi}_k\Big(I_k + (1 - I_k)\mu(\hat{x}_{k-1}, x)\Big),$$

for $x \in \Sigma$. Observe that, under $\mathbb{P}$, $\hat{G}_n^X$ and G_n^X have the same law.

Since in this paper we are interested in the random field of local times of the chain until time n, the order of appearance of the states of X is not relevant for us and we will use the soft local time scheme in a slightly different way from that described above. Specifically, we use the random variables $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ as in the previous construction but now we first construct all the regeneration blocks of size strictly greater than one and then the regeneration blocks of size one.

We proceed by considering the Poisson point process η and the random variables $I_1, I_2, \ldots, I_n$. Then, we define the random set $\mathfrak{H} \subset \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ as

$$\mathfrak{H} = \Big\{j \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n-1\} : I_j I_{j+1} = 1\} \cup \{j \in \{n\} : I_j = 1\Big\}, \tag{3}$$

and the random permutation $\mathfrak{S} : \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ in the following way:

- for $j \in \mathfrak{H}^c$, $\mathfrak{S}(j) = j - \sum_{i=2}^{j-1} I_i I_{i+1}$,
- for $j \in \mathfrak{H}$, $\mathfrak{S}(j) = |\mathfrak{H}^c| + |\{i \in \mathfrak{H} : i \leq j\}|$,

with the convention that $\sum_{i=2}^{k} = 0$ if $k < 2$.

Now, define

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\xi}_1 &= \inf\Big\{\ell \geq 0 : \exists (z_\lambda, t_\lambda) \text{ such that } \ell\nu(z_\lambda) \geq t_\lambda\Big\},\\ \tilde{G}_1^X(x) &= \tilde{\xi}_1 \nu(x), \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma,\end{aligned}$$

and $(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{t}_1)$ to be the unique pair (z_λ, t_λ) satisfying $\tilde{G}_1^X(z_\lambda) = t_\lambda$. Next, for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, n$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\xi}_i = \inf\Big\{\ell \geq 0 : \exists (z_\lambda, t_\lambda) \notin \{(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{t}_k)\}_{k=1}^{i-1} \text{ such that }\\ \tilde{G}_{i-1}^X(z_\lambda) + \ell(I_{\mathfrak{S}^{-1}(i)} + (1 - I_{\mathfrak{S}^{-1}(i)})\mu(\tilde{x}_{i-1}, z_\lambda)) \geq t_\lambda\Big\},\\ \tilde{G}_i^X(x) = \tilde{G}_{i-1}^X(x) + \tilde{\xi}_i(I_{\mathfrak{S}^{-1}(i)} + (1 - I_{\mathfrak{S}^{-1}(i)})\mu(\tilde{x}_{i-1}, x)), \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma,\end{aligned}$$

and $(\tilde{x}_i, \tilde{t}_i)$ to be the unique pair (z_λ, t_λ) out of the set $\{(\tilde{x}_k, \tilde{t}_k)\}_{k=1}^{i-1}$ satisfying $\tilde{G}_i^X(z_\lambda) = t_\lambda$.

At the end of this procedure, we obtain the accumulated soft local time until time n,

$$\tilde{G}_n^X(x) = \tilde{\xi}_1 \nu(x) + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \tilde{\xi}_i(I_{\mathfrak{S}^{-1}(i)} + (1 - I_{\mathfrak{S}^{-1}(i)})\mu(\tilde{x}_{i-1}, x)),$$

for $x \in \Sigma$, observing that $\tilde{G}_n^X$ has the same law as G_n^X and $\hat{G}_n^X$, under $\mathbb{P}$. Also, observe that when proceeding in this way, we obtain the decomposition

$$\tilde{G}_n^X(x) = \tilde{G}_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}^X(x) + (\tilde{G}_n^X(x) - \tilde{G}_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}^X(x)),$$

where $\tilde{G}_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}^X(x)$ is the accumulated soft local time corresponding to the construction of the first block plus the regeneration blocks of size strictly greater than one, until time n.

By implementing this last scheme, one produces a sequence $(\tilde{x}_i)_i$ with n elements, the local time field of which has the law of the local time field of X at time n, just as we wanted. Also, we recall the property (of the soft local times) that the elements in the family $(\tilde{\xi}_i)_i$ are all i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables, independent of all other random elements (cf. [11]).

3.2 Construction of the i.i.d. sequence Y

Now, we describe how we can construct the i.i.d. sequence $Y_1, \ldots, Y_n$ using the soft local time technique.

We denote by $(y_i)_{i\geq 1}$ the elements of Σ which we will consecutively construct. Considering the same Poisson point process η described above, we begin with the construction of y_1 by defining

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_1' &= \inf\Big\{\ell \geq 0 : \exists (z_\lambda, t_\lambda) \text{ such that } \ell \geq t_\lambda\Big\}, \\ G_1^Y(x) &= \xi_1', \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

and (y_1, t_1) to be the unique pair (z_λ, t_λ) satisfying $G_1^Y(z_\lambda) = t_\lambda$.

Then, we proceed to the construction of $y_2, y_3, \ldots, y_n$: for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, n$, define

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i' &= \inf\Big\{\ell \geq 0 : \exists (z_\lambda, t_\lambda) \notin \{(y_k, t_k)\}_{k=1}^{i-1} \text{ such that } G_{i-1}^Y(z_\lambda) + \ell \geq t_\lambda\Big\}, \\ G_i^Y(x) &= G_{i-1}^Y(x) + \xi_i', \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma, \end{aligned}$$

and (y_i, t_i) to be the unique pair (z_λ, t_λ) out of the set $\{(y_k, t_k)\}_{k=1}^{i-1}$ satisfying $G_i^Y(z_\lambda) = t_\lambda$. At the end of this iterative scheme, we obtain the first n elements of the sequence Y. As before, the elements in the family $(\xi_i')_i$ are all i.i.d. Exponential(1) random variables, and independent of all the other quantities.

The use of the soft local times to construct the sequence Y, as described above, produces the accumulated soft local time until time n,

$$G_n^Y(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \xi_k', \text{ for } x \in \Sigma.$$

4 The coupling

Before starting the construction of our coupling we need to introduce some notation. For this, consider the following independent random elements: a sequence $(e_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of Exponential(1) independent random variables, a stationary version of the Markov chain $(X_n)_{n\geq 1}$, which we call $(M_n)_{n\geq 1}$ (that is, $(M_n)_{n\geq 1}$ has transition density p and initial law π), and a Geometric(q) random variable T. Then, we define the random function

$$\widehat{W}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k(1 - p(M_{k-1}, x)), \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma, \tag{4}$$

and consider a sequence of i.i.d. random functions $(\widehat{W}_n)_{n\geq 1}$ with the same law as $\widehat{W}$. We will show in Section 6.1 that

$$\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} E\Big[\sup_{x\in\Sigma} \Big| \sum_{k=1}^{n} \widehat{W}_k(x) \Big| \Big] \leq F \tag{5}$$

where

$$F := C_4 \varepsilon \sqrt{1 + \ln(\varphi 2^\beta) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\frac{\kappa \vee (2\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon} \Big)} \tag{6}$$

and $C_4 = C_4(\varepsilon_0)$ is a positive constant depending on ε_0.

Now, we present the construction of a coupling between the local time fields of the Markov chain X and the i.i.d. sequence Y at time n. We will use the random element $\mathcal{W} := ((I_1, \dots, I_n), \eta)$ (introduced in Section 3) and, the auxiliary random elements V, V', V'' and η' (that we define later in this section), to construct a coupling between two copies of η which we call η_X and η_Y. These copies will be such that the third construction of Section 3.1 applied to η_X and the construction of Section 3.2 applied to η_Y will give high probability of successful coupling of the local time fields of X and Y, for ε sufficiently small.

It is important to stress that the "naïve" coupling (that is, using the same realization of the Poisson marks for constructing both the Markov chain and the i.i.d. sequence) does not work, because it is not probable that both constructions will pick *exactly* the same marks (look at the two marks at the upper right part of the top pictures on Figure 1). To circumvent this, we proceed as shown on Figure 1: we first remove all the marks which are above the "dependent" part (that is, the marks strictly above the curve $\tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}$), and then resample them using the maximal coupling of the "projections". In the following, we describe this construction in a rigorous way.

In order to construct the coupling we are looking for, we assume that, in addition to the Bernoulli sequence $(I_j)_{j\geq 1}$ and the Poisson point process η, the triple $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \mathbb{P})$ (from Section 3) also support an independent copy of η, which we call η'. We will also need other random elements on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \mathbb{P})$ to be defined later. We assume that $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \mathbb{P})$ is large enough to support all these random elements.

We start with the construction of η_X. As explained in Section 3.1, we first use $\mathcal{W}$ to construct the local time field of the Markov chain X up to time n. In this way, we obtain the soft local time curves $\tilde{G}^X_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, together with the sequences $\tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n$ and $\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n$.



Figure 1: Resampling of the "independent parts"

Then, we define the random function

$$\Psi(\cdot) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\xi}_i - \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(\cdot)}{\sum_{i=|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}^{n} \tilde{\xi}_i} \tag{7}$$

and for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ the events

$$\mathsf{A}_i = \Big\{ \sup_{x \in \Sigma} |\Psi(x) - 1| \leq \frac{(1+i)F}{\sqrt{n}} \Big\}, \tag{8}$$

where F is defined in (6). Now, we partition $\tilde{\Omega}$ using the events $\mathsf{B}_1 := \mathsf{A}_1$ and $\mathsf{B}_{i+1} = \mathsf{A}_{i+1} \setminus \mathsf{A}_i$, for $i \geq 1$ and define

$$\mathsf{G} = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}:(1+i)F \leq 1} \mathsf{B}_i.$$

Observe that, on G, Ψ is actually a (random) probability density with respect to π.

Note that, under $\mathbb{P}$, $G'_n := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\xi}_i$ has the same law as G^Y_n, the soft local time of Y at time n (cf. Section 3.2 and the middle right picture on Figure 1). Anticipating on what is coming, on G, the law $\Psi \mathrm{d}\pi$ will serve as the "compensating" law to reconstruct the $|\mathfrak{H}|$ marks of η_Y between $\tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}$ and G'_n.

Now, going back to the construction of η_X, on G, we adopt a resampling scheme: we first "erase" all the marks of the point process η in the space $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}_+$ that are on the curves $\tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}, \ldots, \tilde{G}^X_n$, then we reconstruct the marks as follows. We introduce the random vector $V := (V_1, \ldots, V_{|\mathfrak{H}|})$ such that under $\mathbb{P}[\,\cdot \mid \mathcal{W}]$, its coordinates are independent and distributed according to the invariant measure π. We use the random vector V to place the (new) marks

$$\Big(V_1, \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}(V_1)\Big), \Big(V_2, \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+2}(V_2)\Big), \ldots, \Big(V_{|\mathfrak{H}|}, \tilde{G}^X_n(V_{|\mathfrak{H}|})\Big),$$

on the curves $\tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}, \ldots, \tilde{G}^X_n$ (see Figure 1, bottom left picture). On G^c, we keep the original marks. Hence, η_X is the point process obtained using this resampling procedure.

We continue with the construction of η_Y. We will construct the marks of η_Y below G'_n and then "glue" η' above G'_n to complete the marks of η_Y. We now need the following two random vectors. First, consider the random vector $V' := (V'_1, \ldots, V'_{|\mathfrak{H}|})$ such that under $\mathbb{P}[\,\cdot \mid \mathcal{W} = w]$:
For $w \in \mathsf{G}$,

- V' has independent coordinates distributed according to $\Psi \mathrm{d}\pi$;
- the elements $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}|} \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}}(V_i')\right)_{x\in\Sigma}$ and $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}|} \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}}(V_i)\right)_{x\in\Sigma}$ are maximally coupled;

and for $w \in \mathsf{G}^c$,

- V' has independent coordinates distributed according to π;
- the vectors $(V_1', \dots, V_{|\mathfrak{H}|}')$ and $(V_1, \dots, V_{|\mathfrak{H}|})$ are independent.

We also introduce the random vector $V'' := (V_1'', \dots, V_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}'')$, such that under $\mathbb{P}[\,\cdot \mid \mathcal{W}]$, V'' has independent coordinates distributed according to π and is independent of the pair (V, V').

On G, we construct the marks of the point process η_Y below G_n' in the following way: we keep the marks obtained below $\tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}$ and we use the law $\Psi \mathrm{d}\pi$ to complete the process until G_n'. For this, we adopt a resampling scheme just as before. We first erase all the marks of the point process η that are (strictly) above $\tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}$, then we resample the part of the process η up to G_n', using the marks:

$$\left(V_1', \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(V_1') + \Psi(V_1')\tilde{\xi}_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}\right), \dots, \left(V_j', \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(V_j') + \Psi(V_j')\sum_{i=1}^{j}\tilde{\xi}_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+i}\right), \dots$$
$$\dots, \left(V_{|\mathfrak{H}|}', \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(V_{|\mathfrak{H}|}') + \Psi(V_{|\mathfrak{H}|}')\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}|}\tilde{\xi}_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+i}\right)$$

(see Figure 1, bottom right picture). On G^c, we construct the points below G_n' as follows. We consider the decomposition $G_n' = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}\tilde{\xi}_i + \sum_{i=|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}^{n}\tilde{\xi}_i$. First, we use the random vector V'' to sample the marks

$$\left(V_1'', \tilde{\xi}_1\right), \left(V_2'', \sum_{i=1}^{2}\tilde{\xi}_i\right), \dots, \left(V_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}'', \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}\tilde{\xi}_i\right),$$

on the first $|\mathfrak{H}^c|$ curves. Then, on the second part, we use the random vector V' to sample the marks

$$\left(V_1', \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}\tilde{\xi}_i\right), \left(V_2', \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}^c|+2}\tilde{\xi}_i\right), \dots, \left(V_{|\mathfrak{H}|}', \sum_{i=1}^{n}\tilde{\xi}_i\right),$$

on the $n - |\mathfrak{H}^c|$ last curves.

For the sake of brevity, let us denote by $m_1^X, \dots, m_n^X$ and $m_1^Y, \dots, m_n^Y$, the first coordinates ($\in \Sigma$) of the marks of η_X and η_Y below the curves $\tilde{G}_n^X$

and G'_n respectively. Let $\tilde{L}_n$ and L'_n be the fields of local times associated to these first coordinates, that is, for all $x \in \Sigma$,

$$\tilde{L}_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}}(m_i^X) \quad \text{and} \quad L'_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{x\}}(m_i^Y).$$

By construction, we have the following

Proposition 4.1. *We have that $\eta_X \overset{law}{=} \eta_Y \overset{law}{=} \eta$. Furthermore, it holds that $\tilde{L}_n \overset{law}{=} L_n^X$ and $L'_n \overset{law}{=} L_n^Y$ (where $\overset{law}{=}$ stands for equality in law).*

Consequently, we obtain a coupling between L_n^X and L_n^Y. We will denote by Υ the coupling event associated to this coupling (that is, $\Upsilon = \{\tilde{L}_n = L'_n\}$). In Section 7, we will obtain an upper bound for $\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c]$.

5 Total variation distance between binomial point processes

In this section, we estimate the total variation distance between two binomial point processes on some measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{T})$ with laws $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{Q}_n$ of respective parameters $(\mathbf{p}_n, n)$ and $(\mathbf{q}_n, n)$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{p}_n$, $\mathbf{q}_n$ are two probability laws on $(\Omega, \mathcal{T})$. We also assume that $\mathbf{q}_n \ll \mathbf{p}_n$ and that $\mathbf{p}_n$ and $\mathbf{q}_n$ are close in a certain sense to be defined below.

For two probability measures $\bar{\mu}$ and $\hat{\mu}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{T})$, we recall that if $\bar{\mu} \ll \hat{\mu}$,

$$\|\bar{\mu} - \hat{\mu}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \left| \frac{\mathrm{d}\bar{\mu}}{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mu}} - 1 \right| d\hat{\mu}. \tag{9}$$

We will prove the following result, which is actually a little bit more than we need in this paper.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\delta_0 \in (0, 1]$ and $\delta \in [0, \delta_0)$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x) - 1| \leq \delta n^{-1/2}$ for all $x \in \Omega$. Then, for $C_1(\delta_0) = \exp(\delta_0^2)\frac{\sinh(\delta_0^2)}{\delta_0} + \sqrt{2\pi}\exp(\frac{5}{2}\delta_0^2)$ we have, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{Q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq C_1(\delta_0)\delta.$$

Proof. In this proof, when we want to emphasize the probability law under which we take the expectation we will indicate the law as a subscript. For example, the expectation under some probability law $\bar{\mu}$ will be denoted by $E_{\bar{\mu}}$.

To begin, let us suppose that $n \geq 2$. We first observe that $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{Q}_n$ can be seen as probability measures on the space of n-point measures $\mathcal{M}_n =$

$\{m : m = \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\delta}_{x_i}, x_i \in \Omega, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ endowed with the σ-algebra generated by the mappings $\Phi_B : \mathcal{M}_n \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ defined by $\Phi_B(m) = m(B) = \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\delta}_{x_i}(B)$, for all $B \in \mathcal{T}$. Observe that the law of $\mathbf{P}_n$ (respectively, $\mathbf{Q}_n$) is completely characterized by its values on the sets of the form $\{m \in \mathcal{M}_n : m(B_1) = n_1, \ldots, m(B_J) = n_J\}$, where $J \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $B_1, \ldots, B_J$ are disjoint sets in $\mathcal{T}$ and $n_1, \ldots, n_J$ are non-negative integers such that $n_1 + \cdots + n_J = n$. With this observation it is easy to deduce that $\mathbf{Q}_n \ll \mathbf{P}_n$ and check that its Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to $\mathbf{P}_n$ is given by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{Q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_n}(m) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x_i)$$

where $m = \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\delta}_{x_i}$.
By (9) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{Q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \Big|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{Q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_n}(m) - 1\Big|\mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_n(m) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \Big|\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x_i) - 1\Big|\mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_n(m).\end{aligned}$$

Now, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the function $f_n : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ such that, for $x \in \Omega$, we have $f_n(x) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x) - 1$. Observe that $E_{\mathbf{p}_n}[f_n] = 0$ and that $\|f_n\|_\infty \leq \delta n^{-1/2}$ for all $n \geq 2$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{Q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \Big|\prod_{i=1}^n (1 + f_n(x_i)) - 1\Big|\mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_n(m) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{M}_n} \Big|\exp\Big(\sum_{i=1}^n \ln(1 + f_n(x_i))\Big) - 1\Big|\mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_n(m) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}E_{\mathbf{P}_n}|\exp\{m(g_n)\} - 1| \qquad (10)\end{aligned}$$

where, for all $n \geq 2$, g_n is the function $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by $g_n = \ln(1 + f_n)$ (by using $|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x) - 1| \leq \delta n^{-1/2}$ for all $x \in \Omega$, we can observe that g_n is well defined) and $m(g_n) := \int g_n dm$. Using the fact that $|\ln(1 + x)| \leq 2|x|$ for $x \in (-1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2})$, we deduce that $\|g_n\|_\infty \leq 2\|f_n\|_\infty \leq 2\delta n^{-1/2}$, for all $n \geq 2$.

Now observe that under $\mathbf{P}_n$, $m(g_n)$ has the same law as the sum $g_n(X_1) + \cdots + g_n(X_n)$, where the random variables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are i.i.d. with law $\mathbf{p}_n$. We deduce that

$$E_{\mathbf{P}_n}|\exp\{m(g_n)\} - 1| = E|\exp\{g_n(X_1) + \cdots + g_n(X_n)\} - 1|.$$

Observe that $|E[g_n(X_1)]| = |E[(g_n - f_n)(X_1)]|$ since $E[f_n(X_1)] = E_{\mathbf{p}_n}[f_n] = 0$. Now we use the fact that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $|x| \leq 1/\sqrt{2}$, we have that

$$|\ln(1+x) - x| \leq 2x^2.$$

Since $\|f_n\|_\infty \leq \delta n^{-1/2}$ we obtain that $\|g_n - f_n\|_\infty \leq 2\delta^2 n^{-1}$. We deduce that

$$|E[g_n(X_1)]| \leq \|g_n - f_n\|_\infty \leq 2\delta^2 n^{-1}. \tag{11}$$

Let $Z_n := \sum_{k=1}^n f_n(X_k)$. Using the fact that $|\exp(x) - 1| \leq \exp(|x|) - 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and (11) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{P}_n}|\exp\{(m(g_n)\} - 1| &\leq E\Big[\exp\Big(|Z_n + \sum_{k=1}^n (g_n - f_n)(X_k)|\Big) - 1\Big] \\ &\leq \exp(2\delta^2) E\Big[\exp(|Z_n|)\Big] - 1. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Now let us obtain an upper bound for the expectation of the right-hand side of (12). Using integration by parts, we have

$$E\Big[\exp(|Z_n|)\Big] = 1 + \int_0^\infty e^t P[|Z_n| \geq t] dt. \tag{13}$$

By Hoeffding's inequality, we have, for all $n \geq 2$ and for all $t \geq 0$,

$$P[|Z_n| \geq t] \leq 2\exp\Big(-\frac{t^2}{2\delta^2}\Big).$$

Using this last inequality in (13), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\exp(|Z_n|)\Big] &= 1 + 2\int_0^\infty \exp\Big(t - \frac{t^2}{2\delta^2}\Big) dt \\ &\leq 1 + 2\delta \exp\Big(\frac{\delta^2}{2}\Big)\sqrt{2\pi}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, going back to (12) and using the fact that $\delta < \delta_0$, we deduce that for all $n \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathbf{P}_n}|\exp\{m(g_n)\} - 1| &\leq \exp(2\delta^2)\Big[1 + 2\delta\exp\Big(\frac{\delta^2}{2}\Big)\sqrt{2\pi}\Big] - 1 \\ &\leq \delta\Big[2\exp(\delta^2)\frac{\sinh(\delta^2)}{\delta} + 2\sqrt{2\pi}\exp\Big(\frac{5}{2}\delta^2\Big)\Big] \\ &\leq c_1(\delta_0)\delta, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $c_1(\delta_0) := 2\exp(\delta_0^2)\frac{\sinh(\delta_0^2)}{\delta_0} + 2\sqrt{2\pi}\exp(\frac{5}{2}\delta_0^2)$.

Gathering (10), (14) and considering the fact that $\|\mathbf{P}_1 - \mathbf{Q}_1\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$, we conclude the proof of Proposition 5.1 by taking $C_1 = c_1/2$. □

6 Controlling the "dependent part" of the soft local time

We recall that, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we defined in Section 4 the events

$$\mathsf{A}_i = \Big\{ \sup_{x\in\Sigma} \big|\Psi(x) - 1\big| \le \frac{(1+i)F}{\sqrt{n}} \Big\}.$$

The goal of this section is to prove the following

Proposition 6.1. *There exist a positive constant $C_2 = C_2(\varepsilon_0)$ and $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon_0) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all integer $n \ge n_0$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\mathsf{A}_i^c \;\Big|\; |\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n\Big] \le \frac{C_2}{(1+i)^3}$$

where $q_0 := 1 - \varepsilon_0$.

We postpone the proof of this proposition to Section 6.3. Before that, in Section 6.1 we show (5) and in Section 6.2 we use a concentration inequality to obtain a tail estimate on the numerator of $\Psi - 1$ (see (19)).

6.1 Proof of inequality (5)

In this section, we present a standard method based on bracketing numbers to prove (5). Without loss of generality, we assume in this section that κ from Assumption 2.2 is greater than or equal to 2ε.

We start introducing the space $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^\Sigma$ and the class $\mathfrak{F} = (f_x)_{x\in\Sigma}$ of functions $f_x : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_x(\omega) = \omega(x)$, for $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$.

In this setting, for $s > 0$ and $\mathfrak{E} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ an envelope function of the class $\mathfrak{F}$ (that is, a function such that $\mathfrak{E} \ge |f_x|$ for all $f_x \in \mathfrak{F}$), we need to estimate the bracketing number

$$N_{[]}\Big(s\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2, \mathfrak{F}, L_2\Big),$$

which is defined to be the minimum number of brackets

$$[f_1, f_2] := \Big\{ f : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}; f_1 \le f \le f_2 \Big\},$$

satisfying $\|f_2 - f_1\|_2 < s\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2$, that are needed to cover the class $\mathfrak{F}$, where the given functions f_1 and f_2 have finite L_2-norms (see Definition 2.1.6 of [17]).

For that, we consider an (initially arbitrary) exhaustive and finite collection of subsets of the space Σ, that is, a finite collection $\{\mathsf{D}_i\}_i$ such

that $\mathsf{D}_i \subset \Sigma$ for each i and $\bigcup_i \mathsf{D}_i = \Sigma$, and for each such set D_i we define two functions $f_{\mathsf{D}_i}, \hat{f}_{\mathsf{D}_i} : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$f_{\mathsf{D}_i}(\omega) = \inf_{z_0 \in \mathsf{D}_i} \omega(z_0) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{f}_{\mathsf{D}_i}(\omega) = \sup_{z_0 \in \mathsf{D}_i} \omega(z_0),$$

so that, if $x \in \mathsf{D}_i$ then $f_x \in [f_{\mathsf{D}_i}, \hat{f}_{\mathsf{D}_i}]$. Thus, to each set in the family $\{\mathsf{D}_i\}_i$ we associate a bracket, and so any particular finite exhaustive family of subsets of Σ induces a finite collection of brackets $\{[f_{\mathsf{D}_i}, \hat{f}_{\mathsf{D}_i}]\}_i$ which cover the class $\mathfrak{F}$.

So, in order to properly estimate the bracketing number, the task is to determine a suitable collection $\{\mathsf{D}_i\}_i$ of subsets of Σ in such a way that the induced brackets have their sizes all smaller than $s\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2$. The number of sets in that collection will serve as an upper bound for $N_{[]}$.

Through the following lemma we better characterize the size (in L_2) of the induced brackets we are considering.

Lemma 6.2. *Under Assumption 2.2, it holds that, for any set* $\mathsf{D} \subset \Sigma$*,*

$$\|\hat{f}_{\mathsf{D}} - f_{\mathsf{D}}\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{q} \max_{z,z' \in \mathsf{D}} d^{\gamma}(z, z').$$

Proof. Recalling the notation introduced at the beginning of Section 4, we want to bound the L_2-norm

$$\left\| \hat{f}_{\mathsf{D}}\Big(\widehat{W}_1(\cdot)\Big) - f_{\mathsf{D}}\Big(\widehat{W}_1(\cdot)\Big) \right\|_2 = \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathsf{D}} \widehat{W}_1(z) - \inf_{z \in \mathsf{D}} \widehat{W}_1(z) \right\|_2$$

which is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sup_{z \in \mathsf{D}} \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k(1 - p(M_{k-1}, z)) - \inf_{z \in \mathsf{D}} \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k(1 - p(M_{k-1}, z)) \right\|_2 \\
&\qquad = \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathsf{D}} \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k p(M_{k-1}, z) - \inf_{z \in \mathsf{D}} \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k p(M_{k-1}, z) \right\|_2 \\
&\qquad \leq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k \Big(\sup_{z \in \mathsf{D}} p(M_{k-1}, z) - \inf_{z \in \mathsf{D}} p(M_{k-1}, z) \Big) \right\|_2 \\
&\qquad \leq \kappa \left\| \sum_{k=1}^{T_1} e_k \right\|_2 \max_{z,z' \in \mathsf{D}} d^{\gamma}(z, z'),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption 2.2 to establish the second inequality.

Thus, we conclude the proof by using the fact that $\sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k$ is exponentially distributed with parameter q, so that

$$\Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k \Big\|_2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{q}.$$

□

In view of the above result, we must impose the sets we are constructing, $\{\mathsf{D}_i\}_i$, to be such that

$$\max_{z,z' \in \mathsf{D}_i} d(z, z') < \Big(s\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2 \frac{q}{\sqrt{2}\kappa} \Big)^{1/\gamma}, \text{ for each } i, \tag{15}$$

in order to obtain, from Lemma 6.2, that

$$\|\hat{f}_{\mathsf{D}_i} - f_{\mathsf{D}_i}\|_2 < s\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2, \text{ for each } i. \tag{16}$$

Then, we prove

Proposition 6.3. *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, there exists a universal positive constant C_3 such that, if*

$$\frac{\gamma}{\beta}\Big[1 + \ln(\varphi 2^{\beta}) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{q\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2}\Big)\Big] \geq \frac{1}{2}, \tag{17}$$

then it holds that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E\Big[\sup_{x \in \Sigma} \Big| \sum_{k=1}^{n} \widehat{W}_k(x) \Big|\Big] \leq C_3 \sqrt{1 + \ln(\varphi 2^{\beta}) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{q\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2}\Big)}\, \|\mathfrak{E}\|_2 \sqrt{n}.$$

Proof. For $s > 0$, we just define the sets $\{\mathsf{D}_i\}_i$ to be open balls of radius at most

$$\frac{1}{2}\Big(s\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2 \frac{q}{\sqrt{2}\kappa} \Big)^{1/\gamma},$$

so that (15) is verified (and consequently (16) too, by Lemma 6.2). Then, under Assumption 2.1, we can say that the number of such balls that are needed to cover Σ is at most

$$\varphi 2^{\beta} \Big[\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{qs\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2} \Big]^{\beta/\gamma},$$

and therefore, for any $s > 0$,

$$N_{[]}\Big(s\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2, \mathfrak{F}, L_2\Big) \leq \varphi 2^\beta \Big[\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{qs\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2}\Big]^{\beta/\gamma}.$$

Taking this bound on the bracketing number into account, we can estimate the bracketing entropy integral (of the class $\mathfrak{F}$)

$$J_{[]}\Big(1, \mathfrak{F}, L_2\Big) := \int_0^1 \sqrt{1 + \ln N_{[]}\Big(s\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2, \mathfrak{F}, L_2\Big)} ds,$$

(see its definition e.g. in Section 2.14.1 of [17], page 240). We do that by just bounding it above by

$$\int_0^1 \sqrt{1 + \ln\Big(\varphi 2^\beta \Big[\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{qs\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2}\Big]^{\beta/\gamma}\Big)} ds,$$

which, after some changes of variables, can be shown to be equal to

$$\Big(\frac{\beta}{\gamma}\Big)^{1/2} (\varphi 2^\beta e)^{\gamma/\beta} \Big(\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{q\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2}\Big) \int_{\frac{\gamma}{\beta}[1+\ln(\varphi 2^\beta [\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{q\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2}]^{\beta/\gamma})]}^\infty \sqrt{x} e^{-x} dx.$$

Now, using the asymptotic behaviour of the (upper) incomplete Gamma function

$$\Gamma(y) = \int_y^\infty \sqrt{x} e^{-x} dx$$

as $y \to \infty$, it is elementary to see that there exists a universal positive constant c_1 such that $\Gamma(y) \leq c_1 \sqrt{y} e^{-y}$ for all $y \geq 1/2$. Thus, since we are assuming (17), we have

$$J_{[]}\Big(1, \mathfrak{F}, L_2\Big) \leq c_1 \sqrt{1 + \ln(\varphi 2^\beta) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{q\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2}\Big)}.$$

Finally, we use Theorem 2.14.2 of [17] to obtain that, if (17) holds, then (for a universal positive constant c_2)

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big[\sup_{x\in\Sigma} \Big|\sum_{k=1}^n \widehat{W}_k(x)\Big|\Big] &\leq c_2 J_{[]}\Big(1, \mathfrak{F}, L_2\Big)\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2\sqrt{n} \\ &\leq c_2 c_1 \sqrt{1 + \ln(\varphi 2^\beta) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma} \ln\Big(\frac{\sqrt{2}\kappa}{q\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2}\Big)}\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2\sqrt{n}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof with $C_3 = c_2 c_1$. □

We now investigate the L_2-norm of the envelope $\mathfrak{E}$. If we take, for example, an envelope of $\mathfrak{F}$ given by

$$\mathfrak{E}(\omega) = \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k, \text{ for any } \omega \in \mathcal{S} \tag{18}$$

(so that $\mathfrak{E} \geq |f_x|$ for all $f_x \in \mathfrak{F}$), then we have

Proposition 6.4. *If $\mathfrak{E}$ is given by* (18)*, then it holds that*

$$\|\mathfrak{E}\|_2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{q}\varepsilon.$$

Proof. Use the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{T} e_i$ is exponentially distributed with parameter q. □

Thus, using Propositions 6.3, 6.4 and the fact that $q \geq 1 - \varepsilon_0$, we have under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E\Big[\sup_{x\in\Sigma}\Big|\sum_{k=1}^{n}\widehat{W}_k(x)\Big|\Big] \leq F\sqrt{n}$$

where

$$F := C_4\varepsilon\sqrt{1 + \ln(\varphi 2^\beta) + \frac{\beta}{\gamma}\ln\Big(\frac{\kappa \vee (2\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\Big)},$$

and $C_4 = C_4(\varepsilon_0)$ is a positive constant depending on ε_0.

6.2 A tail bound involving Ψ

Recall the definition of Ψ from (7): for $x \in \Sigma$,

$$\Psi(x) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\tilde{\xi}_i - \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(x)}{\sum_{i=|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}^{n}\tilde{\xi}_i} = 1 + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}\tilde{\xi}_i - \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(x)}{\sum_{i=|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}^{n}\tilde{\xi}_i}. \tag{19}$$

In this section, we will use a concentration inequality from [1], to estimate the tail of the numerator of the last expression above. Recalling the notation of Section 3.1, if we define for $x \in \Sigma$

$$Z_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}\xi_i - G^X_n(x),$$

we observe that $Z_n(\cdot) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}^c|} \tilde{\xi}_i - \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(\cdot)$. Now we use the fact that the Markov chain X has its regenerations at times $(\rho_j)_{j\geq 1}$ and we approximate Z_n by a sum of independent random elements. Specifically, we define

$$W_j(\cdot) = Z_{\rho_{j+1}-1}(\cdot) - Z_{\rho_j-1}(\cdot), \text{ for } j \geq 0,$$

with the convention that $Z_0(\cdot)$=0, and we intend to approximate $Z_n(\cdot)$ by a suitably chosen sum of $W_j(\cdot)$'s.

Write $T_0 = \rho_1 - \rho_0$ for the length of the first block, and

$$T_j = \rho_{j+1} - \rho_j, \qquad j \geq 1,$$

for the lengths of the subsequent regeneration blocks. The random variables $(T_j)_{j\geq 0}$ are i.i.d. Geometric(q). The random elements $(W_j(\cdot))_{j\geq 0}$ are independent and, additionally, the elements $(W_j(\cdot))_{j\geq 1}$ are identically distributed. Also, for any $x \in \Sigma$, we have

$$W_0(x) = \xi_1(1-\nu(x)) + \sum_{k=2}^{T_0} \xi_k(1 - p(x_{k-1}, x)),$$

and, recalling (4),

$$W_1(x) \stackrel{\text{law}}{=} \widehat{W}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k(1 - p(M_{k-1}, x)). \tag{20}$$

Moreover, let us observe the fact that $\mathbb{E}[W_1(x)] = 0$ for any $x \in \Sigma$.

Let us denote, for $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} R_n &= \sup_{x\in\Sigma} \Big| Z_n(x) \Big|, \\ \tilde{R}_m &= \sup_{x\in\Sigma} \Big| \sum_{j=1}^{m} W_j(x) \Big|, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

with the convention that $\tilde{R}_0 = 0$. Observe that in Section 6.1 we actually proved that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{R}_m] \leq F\sqrt{m}, \tag{22}$$

where F is defined in (6).

We now obtain

Proposition 6.5. *For all $\theta > 0$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\Big[R_n \geq 8F\sqrt{n} + 7\theta n\Big] \leq 2\exp\Big\{ -\frac{3}{8}\frac{q^2\theta^2 n}{\varepsilon^2}\Big\} + 6\exp\Big\{ -3C_5\frac{q\theta n}{\varepsilon \ln(3n+1)}\Big\} \\ + 2\exp\Big\{ -\frac{q\theta n}{2\varepsilon}\Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_5 is a universal positive constant.

Proof. We will use an argument analogous to the one used in the proof of Lemma 2.9 in [5]. To begin, let us assume that there exists a positive constant C_5 such that, for all $\theta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{R}_m \geq \frac{3}{2}F\sqrt{m} + \theta m\Big] \leq \exp\Big\{ - \frac{q^2\theta^2 m}{8\varepsilon^2}\Big\} + 3\exp\Big\{ - C_5 \frac{q\theta m}{\varepsilon \ln(m+1)}\Big\}. \tag{23}$$

(This statement will be proved later, in Proposition 6.9).

Using Markov's inequality and (22), it is elementary to show that, for $c_1 = 4/3$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{R}_m \geq \frac{3}{2}c_1 F\sqrt{m} + \theta m\Big] \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{R}_m \geq & 2F\sqrt{m} + \theta m\Big] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2} \wedge \Big(\exp\Big\{ - \frac{q^2\theta^2 m}{8\varepsilon^2}\Big\} + 3\exp\Big\{ - C_5 \frac{q\theta m}{\varepsilon \ln(m+1)}\Big\}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Now, let us define

$$\tilde{M} = \min\Big\{ i \in [0, 3m] : \tilde{R}_i \geq 8F\sqrt{m} + 6\theta m\Big\},$$

with the convention that $\min \emptyset = \infty$, so that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{M} \in [0, 3m]\Big] = \mathbb{P}\Big[\max_{i\in[0,3m]} \tilde{R}_i \geq 8F\sqrt{m} + 6\theta m\Big].$$

Then, using (24) one gets

$$\begin{aligned}\exp\Big\{ - \frac{3}{8}\frac{q^2\theta^2 m}{\varepsilon^2}\Big\} & + 3\exp\Big\{ - 3C_5 \frac{q\theta m}{\varepsilon \ln(3m+1)}\Big\} \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{R}_{3m} \geq 2F\sqrt{3m} + 3\theta m\Big] \\ & \geq \sum_{j=0}^{3m} \mathbb{P}[\tilde{M} = j]\mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{R}_{3m-j} < 2F\sqrt{3m} + 3\theta m\Big] \\ & \geq \mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{M} \in [0, 3m]\Big] \min_{j\in[0,3m]} \mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{R}_{3m-j} < 2F\sqrt{3m - j} + \theta(3m - j)\Big] \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{M} \in [0, 3m]\Big],\end{aligned}$$

which in turn proves that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\max_{i\in[0,3m]}\tilde{R}_i \geq 8F\sqrt{m}+6\theta m\Big] \leq 2\exp\Big\{-\frac{3}{8}\frac{q^2\theta^2 m}{\varepsilon^2}\Big\}+6\exp\Big\{-3C_5\frac{q\theta m}{\varepsilon\ln(3m+1)}\Big\}. \tag{25}$$

Now observe that, if we define

$$\sigma_n = \min\{j\geq 1 : \rho_j > n\},$$

then $\sigma_n - 1$ is a Binomial$(n-1,q)$ random variable, and, under Assumption 2.3,

$$R_n \leq \tilde{R}_{\sigma_n-1} + \varepsilon\sum_{i=n+1}^{\rho_{\sigma_n}}\xi_i + \varepsilon\sum_{i=1}^{\rho_1-1}\xi_i. \tag{26}$$

Note that $\rho_{\sigma_n}-n$ and ρ_1-1 are both Geometric(q) distributed random variables. Consequently, $\sum_{i=n+1}^{\rho_{\sigma_n}}\xi_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\rho_1-1}\xi_i$ are both Exponential(q) distributed and we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\Big[\varepsilon\sum_{i=n+1}^{\rho_{\sigma_n}}\xi_i+\varepsilon\sum_{i=1}^{\rho_1-1}\xi_i\geq\theta n\Big] &\leq \mathbb{P}\Big[\varepsilon\sum_{i=n+1}^{\rho_{\sigma_n}}\xi_i\geq\frac{\theta n}{2}\Big]+\mathbb{P}\Big[\varepsilon\sum_{i=1}^{\rho_1-1}\xi_i\geq\frac{\theta n}{2}\Big]\\ &= 2\exp\Big\{-\frac{q\theta n}{2\varepsilon}\Big\}.\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Finally, using (26) together with (25) and (27), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{P}\Big[R_n\geq 8F\sqrt{n}+7\theta n\Big]\\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\Big[\max_{i\in[0,3n]}\tilde{R}_i\geq 8F\sqrt{n}+6\theta n\Big]+\mathbb{P}\Big[\sum_{i=n+1}^{\rho_{\sigma_n}}\xi_i+\sum_{i=1}^{\rho_1-1}\xi_i\geq\frac{\theta n}{\varepsilon}\Big]\\ &\leq 2\exp\Big\{-\frac{3}{8}\frac{q^2\theta^2 n}{\varepsilon^2}\Big\}+6\exp\Big\{-3C_5\frac{q\theta n}{\varepsilon\ln(3n+1)}\Big\}+2\exp\Big\{-\frac{q\theta n}{2\varepsilon}\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Then, we deduce the following

Corollary 6.6. *For all $i,n\in\mathbb{N}$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[R_n\geq 8F\sqrt{n}(1+i)\Big]\leq 2\exp\Big\{-C_6\frac{F^2i^2}{\varepsilon^2}\Big\}+8\exp\Big\{-C_7\frac{Fi}{\varepsilon}\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\ln(3n+1)}\Big\},$$

where C_6 and C_7 are positive constants that depend on ε_0.

Proof. Take $\theta = \frac{8}{7}\frac{Fi}{\sqrt{n}}$ in Proposition 6.5, and use the fact that $q \geq 1-\varepsilon_0$. $\square$

Before proving assertion (23), which was assumed to be true in the beginning of the proof of Proposition 6.5, we must prove some preliminary results.

Lemma 6.7. *It holds that*

$$\sigma^2 := \sup_{x\in\Sigma} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathbb{E}\Big[W_j(x)^2\Big] \leq \frac{2}{q^2}\varepsilon^2 m.$$

Proof. Since, for any $x \in \Sigma$, the elements of $(W_j(x))_{j\geq 1}$ are i.i.d., we only have to prove that, for any $x \in \Sigma$,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[W_1(x)^2\Big] \leq \frac{2}{q^2}\varepsilon^2.$$

We use (20) and (1) to write, for any $x \in \Sigma$,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[W_1(x)^2\Big] \leq \varepsilon^2 \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k\Big)^2\Big].$$

Since T is Geometric(q), we use the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{T} e_i$ is exponentially distributed with parameter q to see that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[W_1(x)^2\Big] \leq \varepsilon^2 \frac{2}{q^2},$$

and this completes the proof. $\square$

In order to formulate the next lemma, we define the so-called ψ_1-Orlicz norm of a random variable X, in the following way:

$$\|X\|_{\psi_1} = \inf\Big\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E}e^{|X|/t} \leq 2\Big\},$$

see Definition 1 of [1].

Lemma 6.8. *It holds that*

$$\Big\| \max_{1\leq j\leq m} \sup_{x\in\Sigma} |W_j(x)| \Big\|_{\psi_1} \leq C_8 \frac{\varepsilon}{q} \ln(m+1),$$

where C_8 is a universal positive constant.

Proof. First, Lemma 2.2.2 of [17] provides the inequality

$$\Big\| \max_{1\le j\le m} \sup_{x\in\Sigma} |W_j(x)| \Big\|_{\psi_1} \le c_1 \max_{1\le j\le m} \Big\| \sup_{x\in\Sigma} |W_j(x)| \Big\|_{\psi_1} \ln(m+1),$$

for a universal positive constant c_1.

But, due to (1),

$$\sup_{x\in\Sigma} \Big| \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k(1 - p(M_{k-1}, x)) \Big| \le \varepsilon \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k,$$

so that (recall (20))

$$\Big\| \sup_{x\in\Sigma} |W_1(x)| \Big\|_{\psi_1} \le \varepsilon \Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k \Big\|_{\psi_1}.$$

Then, since $\sum_{k=1}^{T} e_k$ is exponentially distributed with mean $1/q$ and the ψ_1-Orlicz norm of an exponential random variable equals twice its mean, we obtain the result (recalling that the W_j's, for $j \ge 1$, are independent and identically distributed). □

Now, in order to address the problem of estimating the probability involving $\tilde{R}_m$ (whose bound was postulated in (23)) from the viewpoint of the theory of empirical processes, we recall the space $\mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^{\Sigma}$ and the class $\mathfrak{F} = (f_x)_{x\in\Sigma}$ of functions $f_x : \mathcal{S} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f_x(\omega) = \omega(x)$, for $\omega \in \mathcal{S}$, so that the above mentioned probability can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\sup_{f_x\in\mathfrak{F}} \Big| \sum_{j=1}^{m} f_x(W_j(\cdot)) \Big| \ge \frac{3}{2} F\sqrt{m} + \theta m \Big], \tag{28}$$

with $W_j(\cdot)$ being interpreted as a vector in $\mathcal{S}$ whose components are $W_j(x)$ for each $x \in \Sigma$. In this setting, we are able to apply Theorem 4 of [1] to prove (23), and this is done in the next proposition.

Proposition 6.9. *There exists a universal positive constant C_5 such that, for all $\theta > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{R}_m \ge \frac{3}{2} F\sqrt{m} + \theta m\Big] \le \exp\Big\{ - \frac{q^2\theta^2 m}{8\varepsilon^2} \Big\} + 3\exp\Big\{ - C_5 \frac{q\theta m}{\varepsilon \ln(m+1)} \Big\}.$$

Proof. We use (22) and just apply Theorem 4 of [1] (with $\delta = 1$, $\eta = 1/2$ and $\alpha = 1$ there) together with Lemmas 6.7 and 6.8, to see that there exist

universal positive constants C and C_8 (C is from Theorem 4 of [1] and C_8 is from Lemma 6.8) such that, for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\tilde{R}_m \geq \frac{3}{2}F\sqrt{m} + t\Big] \leq \exp\Big\{-\frac{q^2t^2}{8\varepsilon^2 m}\Big\} + 3\exp\Big\{-\frac{qt}{C_8 C\varepsilon \ln(m+1)}\Big\}.$$

We conclude the proof by setting $t = \theta m$, for $\theta > 0$, and $C_5 = (C_8 C)^{-1}$. □

6.3 Proof o Proposition 6.1

We begin this section obtaining a tail estimate for the cardinality of the random set $\mathfrak{H}$ introduced in (3), which verifies

$$|\mathfrak{H}| = \sum_{j=2}^{n-1}(I_j I_{j+1}) + I_n. \tag{29}$$

Proposition 6.10. *There exist a positive constant $C_9 = C_9(\varepsilon_0)$ and $n_2 = n_2(\varepsilon_0) \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $n \geq n_2$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[|\mathfrak{H}| \leq \frac{q_0^2}{6}n\Big] \leq \min\Big\{C_9\varepsilon, \frac{1}{2}\Big\}$$

where $q_0 := 1 - \varepsilon_0$.

Proof. First, observe that for $n \geq 4$ we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[|\mathfrak{H}| \leq \frac{q_0^2}{6}n\Big] \leq \mathbb{P}\Big[\sum_{j=2}^{n-1}(I_j I_{j+1}) \leq \frac{q_0^2}{6}n\Big] \leq \mathbb{P}\Big[\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor\frac{n-2}{2}\rfloor}(I_{2k}I_{2k+1}) \leq \frac{q_0^2}{6}n\Big].$$

Moreover, observe that the random variables $(I_{2k}I_{2k+1})$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots, \lfloor\frac{n-2}{2}\rfloor$, are independent Bernoulli(q^2). Now, we recall the standard lower tail bound for the binomial law: for $\mathcal{X} \sim \text{Binomial}(m, p)$ and $\delta \geq 0$, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\mathcal{X} \leq (1-\delta)mp\Big] \leq \exp\{-mI(p,\delta)\},$$

where

$$I(p,\delta) := p(1-\delta)\ln(1-\delta) + p\Big(\frac{1-p}{p} + \delta\Big)\ln\Big(1 + \frac{\delta p}{1-p}\Big).$$

Applying the above formula to the random variable

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor\frac{n-2}{2}\rfloor}(I_{2k}I_{2k+1})$$

with $1-\delta = q_0^2/(2q^2)$, and using the fact that $q \geq q_0$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor} (I_{2k} I_{2k+1}) \leq \frac{q_0^2}{6} n\Big] \leq \exp\Big\{ -\frac{n_1'}{3} I\Big(q^2, 1 - \frac{q_0^2}{2q^2}\Big)\Big\} \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

for $n \geq 12 \vee n_1'$, where $n_1' := \left\lceil \frac{3 \ln 2}{I(q_0^2, 1/2)} \right\rceil$. Finally, recall that $q = 1 - \varepsilon$ to conclude the proof. □

Next, we obtain an upper bound for

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{x \in \Sigma} |\Psi(x) - 1|^3 \;\Big|\; |\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n\Big].$$

Then, the upper bound for $\mathbb{P}[\mathsf{A}_i^c \mid |\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n]$ will be a direct application of Markov's inequality. Applying Proposition 6.10 and recalling (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{x \in \Sigma} |\Psi(x) - 1|^3 \;\Big|\; |\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n\Big] &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{x \in \Sigma} \Big| \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}^c|} \tilde{\xi}_i - \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(x)}{\sum_{i=|\mathfrak{H}^c|+1}^{n} \tilde{\xi}_i} \Big|^3 \mathbb{1}_{\{|\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n\}}\Big] \\
&\leq 2\mathbb{E}\Big[\sup_{x \in \Sigma} \Big| \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathfrak{H}^c|} \tilde{\xi}_i - \tilde{G}^X_{|\mathfrak{H}^c|}(x) \Big|^3\Big] \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \rfloor} \tilde{\xi}_i \Big)^{-3}\Big] \\
&= 2\mathbb{E}[R_n^3] \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \rfloor} \tilde{\xi}_i \Big)^{-3}\Big], \qquad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

where at the second step, we used the fact that, conditionally on $\sigma(I_j, j \geq 1)$ the numerator and the denominator of the ratio in the first line are independent, and the event $\{|\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n\}$ is measurable with respect to $\sigma(I_j, j \geq 1)$. Then, using an integration by parts, Corollary 6.6, and the fact that the square root in (6) is greater than one, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\frac{R_n}{8F\sqrt{n}}\Big)^3\Big] &= 3\int_0^\infty t^2 \mathbb{P}\Big[\frac{R_n}{8F\sqrt{n}} > t\Big] dt \\
&\leq 1 + 3\int_1^\infty t^2 \mathbb{P}\Big[\frac{R_n}{8F\sqrt{n}} > t\Big] dt \\
&\leq c_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where c_1 is a universal positive constant. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[R_n^3] \leq c_2 F^3 n^{3/2}, \qquad (31)$$

where c_2 is a universal positive constant. On the other hand, since $\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \rfloor} \tilde{\xi}_i\Big)^{-1}$ is an Inverse Gamma random variable with parameters $(\lfloor \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \rfloor, 1)$, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \rfloor} \tilde{\xi}_i\Big)^{-3}\Big] = \frac{1}{(\lfloor \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \rfloor - 1)(\lfloor \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \rfloor - 2)(\lfloor \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \rfloor - 3)} \leq c_3 n^{-3} \tag{32}$$

for $n \geq 24/q_0^2$ and c_3 a positive constant depending on ε_0. Gathering (30), (31), and (32) and applying Markov's inequality we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\mathsf{A}_i^c \;\Big|\; |\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n\Big] \leq \frac{C_2}{(1+i)^3}$$

for some positive constant $C_2 = C_2(\varepsilon_0)$. □

7 Proof of Theorem 2.4

For $n \geq n_0$ (where n_0 is from Proposition 6.1), we estimate $\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c]$ from above (recall that Υ is the coupling event from Section 4) to obtain an upper bound on the total variation distance between L_n^X and L_n^Y. At this point, we mention that we will use the notation from Section 4. By definition of the total variation distance, we have that

$$\|L_n^X - L_n^Y\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c]. \tag{33}$$

First, let us decompose Υ according to $\mathsf{C} := \{|\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n\}$ (recall (3)) and its complement:

$$\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c] = \mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c, \mathsf{C}] + \mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c, \mathsf{C}^c] \leq \mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c, \mathsf{C}] + \mathbb{P}[\mathsf{C}^c]. \tag{34}$$

Now we use the partition B_i, $i \geq 1$, defined in Section 4, to write

$$\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c, \mathsf{C}] = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c, \mathsf{B}_i, \mathsf{C}].$$

Since $\mathsf{B}_i \cap \mathsf{C}$ is $\sigma(\mathcal{W})$-measurable (we recall that $\mathcal{W}$ was introduced in Section 4), we have that

$$\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c, \mathsf{B}_i, \mathsf{C}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\mathsf{B}_i \cap \mathsf{C}} \mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c \mid \mathcal{W}]].$$

Then, observe that from the coupling construction of Section 4, we have on the set $\mathsf{G} \cap \mathsf{C}$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c \mid \mathcal{W}] \leq \Big\| \mathbb{P}[V \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{W}] - \mathbb{P}[V' \in \cdot \mid \mathcal{W}] \Big\|_{\mathrm{TV}}.$$

Hence, applying Proposition 5.1 to the term in the right-hand side with $\delta_0 = 1$ we obtain, on the sets $\mathsf{B}_i \cap \mathsf{C}$ such that $\mathsf{B}_i \subset \mathsf{G}$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c \mid \mathcal{W}] \leq C_1(1)(1+i)F.$$

Since $C_1(1) > 1$ this last upper bound is still valid on the sets $\mathsf{B}_i \cap \mathsf{C}$ such that $\mathsf{B}_i \subset \mathsf{G}^c$. We deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c, \mathsf{C}] \leq C_1(1)F \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}(i+1)\mathbb{P}[\mathsf{B}_i, \mathsf{C}] \leq C_1(1)F\Big(2 + \sum_{i=2}^{\infty}(i+1)\mathbb{P}[\mathsf{A}_{i-1}^c \mid \mathsf{C}]\Big),$$

which by Proposition 6.1 implies

$$\mathbb{P}[\Upsilon^c, \mathsf{C}] \leq c_1 F \tag{35}$$

for some positive constant $c_1 = c_1(\varepsilon_0)$. Finally, combining (33), (34), (35), Proposition 6.10 and (6), we obtain Theorem 2.4 for $n \geq n_0$. For $n < n_0$, we simply perform a step-by-step coupling between the Markov chain X and the sequence Y (as described in the introduction) to obtain $\|L_n^X - L_n^Y\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq n_0\varepsilon$ and thus prove Theorem 2.4. □

8 Proof of Theorem 2.5

First, we prove a preliminary lemma. As in Section 5, consider again two binomial point processes on some measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{T})$ with laws $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{Q}_n$ of respective parameters $(\mathbf{p}_n, n)$ and $(\mathbf{q}_n, n)$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbf{p}_n$, $\mathbf{q}_n$ are two probability laws on $(\Omega, \mathcal{T})$ such that $\mathbf{q}_n \ll \mathbf{p}_n$. Then, we have

Lemma 8.1. *Let $\delta > 0$ such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x) - 1| \leq \delta n^{-1/2}$ for all $x \in \Omega$. Then*

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \|\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{Q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - C_{10}(\delta),$$

where $C_{10}(\delta)$ is a positive constant depending on δ.

Proof. As pointed out in the proof of Proposition 5.1, $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{Q}_n$ can be seen as probability measures on the space of n-point measures

$$\mathcal{M}_n = \Big\{m : m = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{x_i}, x_i \in \Omega, 1 \leq i \leq n\Big\}$$

endowed with the σ-algebra generated by the mappings $\Phi_B : \mathcal{M}_n \to \mathbb{Z}_+$ defined by $\Phi_B(m) = m(B) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{x_i}(B)$, for all $B \in \mathcal{T}$. Also, recall that $\mathbf{Q}_n \ll \mathbf{P}_n$ and its Radon-Nikodym derivative with respect to $\mathbf{P}_n$ is given by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{Q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{P}_n}(m) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x_i)$$

where $m = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{x_i}$. Moreover, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, recall the functions $f_n, g_n : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$f_n(x) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x) - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad g_n(x) = \ln(f_n(x) + 1), \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega.$$

We start by proving the lemma for all large enough n.

It is convenient to introduce now two new distinct elements $\mathbf{0}_1$ and $\mathbf{0}_2$ in order to define a new space $\hat{\Omega} = \Omega \cup \{\mathbf{0}_1, \mathbf{0}_2\}$ (we assume that $\mathbf{0}_1, \mathbf{0}_2 \notin \Omega$), endowed with the σ-algebra $\hat{\mathcal{T}} := \sigma(\mathcal{T}, \{\mathbf{0}_1\})$. Then, on $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{T}})$ we consider a new binomial point process with law $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}$ of parameters $(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n, k)$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n$ is the probability law on $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{T}})$ given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n(A) = \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{p}_n(A)}{2}, & \text{for } A \in \mathcal{T}, \\ \frac{1}{4}, & \text{for } A \in \{\{\mathbf{0}_1\}, \{\mathbf{0}_2\}\}, \end{cases}$$

Additionally, for $n > \delta^2$, consider another binomial point process on $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{T}})$ with law $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}$ and parameters $(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_n, k)$, where $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_n$ is the probability law on $(\hat{\Omega}, \hat{\mathcal{T}})$ such that $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_n(A) = \frac{\mathbf{q}_n(A)}{2}$ for all $A \in \mathcal{T}$ and

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_n(\{\mathbf{0}_1\}) = \frac{1}{4}\Big(1 + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{n}}\Big), \ \hat{\mathbf{q}}_n(\{\mathbf{0}_2\}) = \frac{1}{4}\Big(1 - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{n}}\Big)$$

so that $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_n(\{\mathbf{0}_1\}) + \hat{\mathbf{q}}_n(\{\mathbf{0}_2\}) = 1/2$. Thus, $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}$ can be seen as probability measures on the space

$$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k = \Big\{\hat{m} : \hat{m} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{x_i}, x_i \in \hat{\Omega}, 1 \le i \le k\Big\}.$$

We need to introduce the corresponding functions $\hat{f}_n, \hat{g}_n, : \hat{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\hat{f}_n(x) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{q}}_n}{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n}(x) - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{g}_n(x) = \ln(\hat{f}_n(x) + 1).$$

Also, define $\hat{h}_n : \hat{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}$ as $\hat{h}_n = \delta^{-1} n^{1/2} \hat{f}_n$ and the set $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}} = \Big\{\hat{m} \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_k : \frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}}{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}}(\hat{m}) \ge 1\Big\}$. Since

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}}{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}}(\hat{m}) \ge 1 \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ln\Big(\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{q}}_n}{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n}(x_i)\Big) \ge 0,$$

for $\hat{m} \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_k$, we have for any $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k} - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} &= \int_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k} \Big(\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}}{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}}(\hat{m}) - 1\Big)^+ \mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}(\hat{m}) \\ &= \int_{\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k^{\hat{\mathbf{Q}}}} \Big(\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}}{\mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}}(\hat{m}) - 1\Big) \mathrm{d}\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}(\hat{m}) \\ &\leq 1 - \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}\Big[\hat{m}(\hat{g}_n) \geq 0\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Next, we will bound $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,2n}[\hat{m}(\hat{g}_n) \geq 0]$ from above.

If we define $n_2 = n_2(\delta) = \lceil 3\delta^2 \rceil$ then using the fact that $\ln(1+x) \geq x - x^2$ for $x \in (-1/\sqrt{3}, 1/\sqrt{3})$, we have that, for $n \geq n_2$,

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,2n}\Big[\hat{m}(\hat{g}_n) \geq 0\Big] \geq \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,2n}\Big[\hat{m}(\hat{f}_n) \geq \hat{m}(\hat{f}_n^2)\Big] = \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,2n}\left[\frac{\hat{m}(\hat{h}_n)}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \delta \frac{\hat{m}(\hat{h}_n^2)}{n}\right].$$

On the other hand, observe that, under $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,2n}$, the random variables $\hat{m}(\hat{h}_n)$ and $\hat{m}(\hat{h}_n^2)$ have the same law as $\hat{h}_n(\hat{X}_1) + \cdots + \hat{h}_n(\hat{X}_{2n})$ and $\hat{h}_n^2(\hat{X}_1) + \cdots + \hat{h}_n^2(\hat{X}_{2n})$, respectively, where the random variables $\hat{X}_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_{2n}$ are i.i.d. with law $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n$. Moreover, we have that $|\hat{h}_n(\hat{X}_1)| \leq 1$, $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n$-a.s., $E_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n}[\hat{h}_n(\hat{X}_1)] = 0$ and $\sigma^2 := E_{\hat{\mathbf{p}}_n}[\hat{h}_n^2(\hat{X}_1)] \geq 1/2$. If we denote the standard Normal distribution function by Φ, and take $n_3 = n_3(\delta) = 4\lceil \frac{1}{(1-\Phi(\delta))^2} \rceil \vee n_2$, then, by using the Berry-Esseen theorem (with $1/2$ as an upper bound for the Berry-Esseen constant, see for example [16]), we obtain that, for $n \geq n_3$,

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,2n}\left[\frac{\hat{m}(\hat{h}_n)}{\sqrt{2n}} \geq \delta \frac{\hat{m}(\hat{h}_n^2)}{n\sqrt{2}}\right] \geq \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,2n}\left[\frac{\hat{m}(\hat{h}_n)}{\sigma\sqrt{2n}} \geq \frac{\delta}{\sigma\sqrt{2}}\right] \geq c_1,$$

where

$$c_1 = c_1(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \Phi(\delta)\Big).$$

Then observe that the above implies that

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,2n} - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,2n}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - c_1, \tag{36}$$

for all $n \geq n_3$.

Now, denote by $\hat{\mu}_{n,k}$ the maximal coupling of $\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}$, and by $(\hat{m}_1, \hat{m}_2)$ the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k \times \hat{\mathcal{M}}_k$. Let K be the coupling event (that is, $\mathsf{K} = \{(\hat{m}_1, \hat{m}_2) : \hat{m}_1 = \hat{m}_2\}$), K_1 the coupling event of $(\hat{m}_i(\{\mathbf{0}_1\}), \hat{m}_i(\{\mathbf{0}_2\}))$,

for $i = 1, 2$, and K_2 the coupling event of $(\hat{m}_i(A))_{A\in\mathcal{T}}$, for $i = 1, 2$, and also observe that $\mathsf{K} = \mathsf{K}_1 \cap \mathsf{K}_2$. Thus, we deduce that, for all $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k} - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} &= 1 - \hat{\mu}_{n,k}[\mathsf{K}] \\
&= 1 - \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \hat{\mu}_{n,k}[\mathsf{K}_1 \cap \mathsf{K}_2, \hat{m}_1(\{\mathbf{0}_1, \mathbf{0}_2\}) = \hat{m}_2(\{\mathbf{0}_1, \mathbf{0}_2\}) = \ell] \\
&\geq \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \Big(1 - \hat{\mu}_{n,k}[\mathsf{K}_2 \mid \hat{m}_1(\{\mathbf{0}_1, \mathbf{0}_2\}) = \hat{m}_2(\{\mathbf{0}_1, \mathbf{0}_2\}) = \ell]\Big)\mathfrak{p}_\ell^k \\
&= \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \hat{\mu}_{n,k}[\mathsf{K}_2^c \mid \hat{m}_1(\{\mathbf{0}_1, \mathbf{0}_2\}) = \hat{m}_2(\{\mathbf{0}_1, \mathbf{0}_2\}) = \ell]\mathfrak{p}_\ell^k \\
&\geq \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \mathfrak{p}_\ell^k \|\mathbf{P}_{n,\ell} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,\ell}\|_{\mathrm{TV}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{p}_\ell^k$ is the probability mass function of a Binomial$(k, 1/2)$ random variable at ℓ and $\mathbf{P}_{n,\ell}$ (respectively, $\mathbf{Q}_{n,\ell}$) is a binomial process with paramenters $(\mathbf{p}_n, \ell)$ (respectively, $(\mathbf{q}_n, \ell)$).

Using (36) and the fact that $\|\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k} - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}\|_{\mathrm{TV}}$ is non decreasing in k (this follows from the fact that $\|\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{n,k} - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_{n,k}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} = \frac{1}{2}E[|1 - \mathcal{L}_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k)|]$, where $(X_i)_{i\geq 1}$ are i.i.d random variables with law $\mathbf{p}_n$ and $\mathcal{L}_k(X_1, \ldots, X_k) := \Pi_{i=1}^k \frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(X_i)$ is a martingale under the canonical filtration), we obtain that, for all $n \geq n_3$ and $i \leq n$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{2i} \mathfrak{p}_k^{2i} \|\mathbf{P}_{n,k} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,k}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - c_1. \tag{37}$$

Using again the Berry-Esseen theorem (once again with $1/2$ as an upper bound for the Berry-Esseen constant), we can deduce that there exist $n_4 = n_4(\delta) = \lceil (\frac{12}{1-\Phi(\delta)})^2 \rceil$ and $c_2 = c_2(\delta) = -\frac{1}{2}\Phi^{-1}(\frac{1-\Phi(\delta)}{24}) \geq 1$, such that for all $i \geq n_4$, we have

$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}_i(\delta)} \mathfrak{p}_k^{2i} \geq 1 - \frac{c_1}{3},$$

where $\mathcal{I}_i(\delta) := [i - c_2\sqrt{i}, i + c_2\sqrt{i}]$. On the other hand, if $i \geq n_3$, by (37) it follows that

$$\sum_{k\in\mathcal{I}_i(\delta)} \mathfrak{p}_k^{2i} \|\mathbf{P}_{n,k} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,k}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - c_1(\delta),$$

so that, if $i \geq n_3 \vee n_4$, there exists $i_0 \in \mathcal{I}_i(\delta)$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{P}_{n,i_0} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,i_0}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq \frac{1 - c_1}{1 - \frac{c_1}{3}} \leq 1 - \frac{2}{3}c_1.$$

To conclude the proof of the lemma, observe that for any n large enough, there exists $i \geq n_3 \vee n_4 \vee c_2^2$ such that $n - (i + \lfloor c_2\sqrt{i} \rfloor) \in [0,3]$, the above argument allows to obtain $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n - 5c_2\sqrt{n} \leq i_0 \leq n$ and

$$\|\mathbf{P}_{n,i_0} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,i_0}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - \frac{2}{3}c_1. \tag{38}$$

Now, if $n - i_0 \leq (n_3 \vee n_4 \vee c_2^2) + 5\sqrt{5}c_2^{3/2}n^{1/4}$, using (38) and making a point-by-point coupling between the $n - i_0$ remaining points of the binomial processes $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{Q}_n$, we obtain that

$$\|\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{Q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - \frac{2}{3}c_1(\delta)\left(1 - \frac{[(n_3 \vee n_4 \vee c_2^2) + 5\sqrt{5}c_2^{3/2}n^{1/4}]\delta}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^+. \tag{39}$$

On the other hand, if $n - i_0 > (n_3 \vee n_4 \vee c_2^2) + 5\sqrt{5}c_2^{3/2}n^{1/4}$, we first consider $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$n - i_0 - (j - i_0 + \lfloor c_2\sqrt{j - i_0} \rfloor) \in [0,3].$$

Observe that in this case, $j - i_0 > n_3 \vee n_4 \vee c_2^2$ and thus by the former analysis we obtain that there exists $j_0 > i_0$ such that $n - 5\sqrt{5}c_2^{3/2}n^{1/4} \leq j_0 \leq n$ and

$$\|\mathbf{P}_{n,j_0-i_0} - \mathbf{Q}_{n,j_0-i_0}\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - \frac{2}{3}c_1. \tag{40}$$

Using (38), (40) and performing a point-by-point coupling between the $n - j_0$ remaining points of the binomial processes $\mathbf{P}_n$ and $\mathbf{Q}_n$, we obtain that

$$\|\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{Q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - \left(\frac{2}{3}c_1\right)^2\left(1 - \frac{5\sqrt{5}c_2^{3/2}n^{1/4}\delta}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)^+. \tag{41}$$

Finally, using (39) and (41), we obtain that there exists $n_5 = n_5(\delta)$ such that, for $n \geq n_5$ we have that

$$\|\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{Q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - c_3, \tag{42}$$

where $c_3 = c_3(\delta)$ is a positive constant depending on δ.

To finish the proof of Lemma 8.1, we consider the case $n < n_5$. Since $\mathbf{q}_n \ll \mathbf{p}_n$ and $|\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{q}_n}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{p}_n}(x) - 1| \leq \delta$ for all $x \in \Omega$, we first observe that

$$\max_{1 \leq n < n_5} \|\mathbf{p}_n - \mathbf{q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{1+\delta}.$$

Then, from this last fact we obtain that

$$\max_{1 \leq n < n_5} \|\mathbf{P}_n - \mathbf{Q}_n\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - \left(\frac{1}{1+\delta}\right)^{n_5}.$$

Together with (42), this concludes the proof of Lemma 8.1. □

We now prove Theorem 2.5.

For this proof, we consider $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon$ in Assumption 2.3. We start taking $i = i_1 := \lceil (2C_2)^{1/3} \rceil - 1$ in Proposition 6.1, so that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\mathsf{A}_{i_1} \;\Big|\; |\mathfrak{H}| > \frac{q_0^2}{6} n \Big] \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

for all $n \geq n_0$ (where n_0 is from Proposition 6.1). Then, using Proposition 6.10, we obtain that $\mathbb{P}[\mathsf{A}_{i_1}] \geq 1/4$, for $n \geq n_0$. Now, observe that, by Lemma 8.1, for all $n \geq n_0' = n_0'(\beta, \varphi, \kappa, \gamma, \varepsilon_0) := n_0 \vee [F(1+i_1)]^2$ (where F is given in (6) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0$) we obtain that

$$\|L_n^X - L_n^Y\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}[\Upsilon] \leq 1 - \mathbb{P}[\Upsilon, \mathsf{A}_{i_1}] \leq 1 - \frac{1}{4} C_{10}((1+i_1)F). \tag{43}$$

Then, to complete the proof we just observe that

$$\max_{1 \leq n < n_0'} \|L_n^X - L_n^Y\|_{\mathrm{TV}} \leq 1 - \Big(\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon_0} \Big)^{n_0'}. \tag{44}$$

Finally, using (43) and (44), we conclude the proof of Theorem 2.5. □

Acknowledgements

Diego F. de Bernardini thanks São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) (grant #2016/13646-4) and Fundo de Apoio ao Ensino, à Pesquisa e à Extensão (FAEPEX) (grant #2866/16). Christophe Gallesco was partially supported by CNPq (grant 313496/2014-5). Serguei Popov was partially supported by CNPq (grant 300886/2008–0).

References

[1] Adamczak, R.: A tail inequality for suprema of unbounded empirical processes with applications to Markov chains. Electronic Journal of Probability, 13, 1000–1034 (2008)

[2] de Bernardini, D. F., Gallesco, C., Popov, S.: An improved decoupling inequality for random interlacements. Work in progress.

[3] Bhattacharya, S.K., Gupta, A.K.: Occupation times for two-state Markov chains. Discrete Applied Mathematics, 2 (3), 249–250 (1980)

[4] Comets, F., Gallesco, C., Popov, S., Vachkovskaia, M.: On large deviations for the cover time of two-dimensional torus. Electr. J. Probab., 18, article 96, (2013).

[5] Comets, F., Popov, S.: The vacant set of two-dimensional critical random interlacements is infinite. arXiv:1606.05805

[6] Dembo, A., Sznitman, A.–S.: On the disconnection of a discrete cylinder by a random walk. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields, 136 (2), 321–340, (2006).

[7] Ding, J., Lee, J.R., Peres, Y.: Cover times, blanket times, and majorizing measures. Annals of Math., 175 (3), 1409–1471, (2012)

[8] Ferrari P., Galves A.: Construction of stochastic processes, coupling and regeneration. Facultad de Ciencias de la Universidad de los Andes, Mérida, Venezuela (2000)

[9] Yueyun Hu and Zhan Shi: The most visited sites of biased random walks on trees. Electron. J. Probab. paper no. 62, (2015).

[10] Miller, J., Sousi, P.: Uniformity of the late points of random walk on $\mathbb{Z}_n^d$ for $d \geq 3$. To appear in: Probab. Theory Relat. Fields.

[11] Popov, S., Teixeira, A.: Soft local times and decoupling of random interlacements. J. Eur. Math. Soc., 17 (10), 2545–2593, (2015)

[12] Rosen, J.: Isomorphism Theorems: Markov Processes, Gaussian Processes and Beyond. In: Lecture Notes in Mathematics. Correlated Random Systems: Five Different Methods. Springer, 2013

[13] Sznitman, A.–S.: Vacant set of random interlacements and percolation. Ann. Math. (2) 171 (3), 2039–2087, (2010)

[14] Sznitman, A.–S.: Topics in occupation times and Gaussian free fields. Zurich Lect. Adv. Math., European Mathematical Society, Zürich, (2012)

[15] Tóth, B.: No more than three favorite sites for simple random walk. Ann. Probab. 29 (1), 484–503, (2001)

[16] Tyurin, I. S.: Refinement of the upper bounds of the constants in Lyapunov's theorem. Russian Mathematical Surveys 65 (3), 586–588, (2010)

[17] van der Vaart, A. W., Wellner, J. A.: Weak convergence and empirical processes - With applications to statistics. Springer Series in Statistics, Springer (1996)